

County of Loudoun
Department of Planning
MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 30, 2006

TO: Loudoun County Planning Commission

FROM: Susan Berry-Hill, AICP
Lou Mosurak, AICP

SUBJECT: **July 6, 2006 Planning Commission Worksession:
CPAM 2006-0002 & ZMAP 2005-0011—Crosstrail**

The Planning Commission held a Public Hearing on the Crosstrail Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPAM) and Rezoning (ZMAP) applications on June 19, 2006; the Commission voted 8-0-1 (Herbert—absent) to forward the applications to committee for further discussion. Presentations were made by County staff, the Applicant, the Leesburg Airport Commission, and Town of Leesburg staff. A total of 28 individuals spoke regarding the applications; 26 speakers voiced concerns regarding the proposals, and two individuals spoke in support of the project. Written comments from an additional individual in support of the project were received following the public hearing and were subsequently distributed to the Planning Commission. Speakers in opposition to the project included the Mayor of the Town of Leesburg as well as members of the Leesburg Airport Commission, Leesburg Economic Development Commission and Leesburg Planning Commission. The majority of speakers at the public hearing cited concerns regarding the introduction of residential uses near the Leesburg Airport. Concerns regarding utility provision and transportation impacts were also cited.

Commission members asked a number of questions at the Public Hearing; staff has organized these questions into five (5) categories, namely (1) airport, (2) land use, (3) fiscal, (4) utilities, and (5) transportation. Commission questions and staff responses on each topic are provided below. Additionally, other outstanding issues noted by staff at the public hearing are also included below.

As of this writing, staff is of the understanding that airport, land use, and fiscal issues will be discussed at the July 6th worksession, and has asked representatives of the Leesburg Airport Commission and County budget/fiscal staff to attend the meeting on that date. Given this understanding, staff anticipates that utilities and transportation issues will be discussed at a future worksession on a date to be determined, and will request LCSA and Town utilities staff as well as transportation staff to attend that meeting.

Airport

The Commission asked a number of airport-related questions at the public hearing; staff responses to these questions are outlined below and in *Attachments 1 through 8, 15 and 17*. The executive summary of the 2003 Virginia Air Transportation System Plan Update is provided as *Attachment 2*.

Airport Operations

Operational since 1964, the Leesburg Executive Airport was utilized through the mid-1980s primarily by private pilots. Through the mid-1990s it was primarily operated by a Fixed Base Operator (FBO) under contract to the Town. Following the business failure of that FBO in 1992 and a subsequent legal settlement, the Airport became professionally managed by the Town of Leesburg. Leesburg Airport is now home to 235 based aircraft, two flight schools, a Medevac helicopter, and eight corporate aircraft operators. The Commonwealth of Virginia forecasts an increase in based aircraft to 357 by 2025. Leesburg Airport sustains 110,000 aircraft operations per year, which include takeoffs and landings. These operations equate to approximately 300 operations per day. Additional notes and information on airport operations (compiled by Planning staff) is provided as *Attachment 1*. A list of arrivals and destinations of aircraft using Leesburg Airport is provided as *Attachment 3*.

Airport Reliever Function

The Leesburg Executive Airport is one of three designated relievers on the Virginia Air Transportation System for Washington Dulles International Airport and one of only six total relievers in the state. The other Dulles relievers are Manassas Regional Airport and Warrenton-Fauquier Airport. As a reliever, Leesburg Executive Airport provides general aviation aircraft with an alternative to the larger Dulles Airport, thereby reducing congestion and helping to ensure efficient commercial air operations at Dulles, convenient and affordable business travel at Leesburg, and safe private operations for smaller aircraft. Without an effective reliever, larger and faster commercial air traffic at Dulles would likely experience significant delays with impacts to connecting commercial airports both within the continental United States and overseas. In addition to smaller passenger capacities per aircraft than the larger commercial aircraft, corporate aircraft have differing engine blast effects and climb out speeds. Such differences result in increased taxi distances between aircraft, increased takeoff and landing separations, and induced delays. Differing airspeeds also increase the complexity of airspace management for air traffic control agencies. Practically speaking, Dulles can operate more efficiently because of Leesburg's capacity to serve smaller, corporate aircraft traveling to and from Northern Virginia.

Aircraft Noise

The current noise contours for the Leesburg Executive Airport were developed in 1985 with a forecast year of 1993 for a 5,500-foot runway. The 65 Ldn contour has been added to the plan set (Sheet 20) to depict its position over the proposed development (*Attachment 17*). The 1985 model did not include a 60 Ldn line. These contours are no longer optimal for a number of reasons. One issue is that the contours do not reflect the most current operational forecasts. Additionally, the Airport expects to extend the runway to 6,000 feet, significantly changing the location of the contours at the runway's southern end. New contours are expected to be developed as part of the current Airport Master Plan Update. These contours are expected to be more refined than the 1985 product and include a 60 Ldn line.

A consideration worth noting in the use of airport noise contours is that the contours reflect 24-hour averages. Unlike Dulles Airport, which is a large commercial airport with nearly continuous operations, the Leesburg Executive Airport is a general aviation airport with less frequent operations. A reduced operational frequency has the potential to minimize the significance of noise spikes from individual operations and result in significant noise events outside of the published contours. Such events are anticipated due to the high power settings associated with takeoffs and landings, which are normal occurrences at an airport. Aircraft can be expected to perform frequent overflights of the Applicant's property during takeoffs, departures, arrivals, traffic pattern operations, and as part of instrument procedures. Noise is also anticipated due to

nighttime engine runs for maintenance and engine run-ups during preflight actions. Additional notes on noise characteristics (compiled by Planning staff) is provided as *Attachment 4*.

Height Surfaces

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulates navigable airspace around airports in the United States through the use of imaginary surfaces, commonly referred to as Part 77 surfaces. These include the primary, horizontal, conical, approach, and transitional surfaces. Such surfaces are defined in Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The FAA also provides direction concerning Runway Protection Zones beyond the ends of each runway, which help ensure safety immediately adjacent to runways.

Economic Impact

The Commonwealth of Virginia completed an economic impact study of the Virginia Airport System, including the Leesburg Executive Airport, in 2004. Excerpts from this study, including a specific overview of economic impacts of Leesburg Executive Airport, are provided as *Attachment 5*. The study found that the Leesburg Airport is responsible for the creation of 617 jobs and has an economic impact of just over \$40 million from both direct and secondary spin-off effects. A June 2006 survey of jobs at the Airport found a total of 177 people were directly employed at the Leesburg Airport.

Funding

Much of the funding for the improvements at the Leesburg Airport comes from the FAA. Since 1982, the FAA has awarded 31 grants and nearly \$24 million for improvements to the Leesburg Airport. The FAA has also indicated a commitment to the funding of future land purchases necessitated by the Airport's planned expansion. Information on grant history at Leesburg Airport as well as general information regarding the assurances which airport sponsors (in this case, the Town of Leesburg) must make to the FAA is provided as *Attachments 6 and 7*, respectively.

Master Plan

Physical improvements planned as part of the current Airport Master Plan Update include a 500-foot runway expansion to 6,000', an expansion of the Airport's ramp space with associated hangar construction, and the installation of a precision approach system. Such enhancements are expected to help meet the needs of the 357 aircraft forecasted to be based at the Airport by 2025. Current land holdings are expected to allow the Airport to meet its growth needs through 2010. Additional purchases appear necessary, however, to allow continued growth through 2025. A draft Airport Layout Plan from the Airport Master Plan Update is provided as *Attachment 15*.

Town Comments

In addition to the comments made at the public hearing, the Vice Chair of the Airport Commission has provided comments to staff in an email dated June 28, 2006; this email has been forwarded to the Commission and is also provided as *Attachment 8*. The Airport Commission will be present at the worksession to further discuss these applications and address any additional questions.

Land Use/Site Design

Under currently adopted County policies, the site is planned for Business Employment uses (i.e., a mix of office and light industrial uses with no residential component) in order to provide uses complementary to and which would enhance the viability of Leesburg Airport. The vast majority of the site (434 of the 491 acres) is currently zoned JLMA-20 in order to promote uses consistent with the adjacent airport. As requested at the public hearing, a more detailed vicinity map of the

area surrounding the site is provided as *Attachment 16*. Questions posed at the public hearing and staff responses are provided below.

Overview of Development Proposal/Outdoor Spaces, etc.

The Commission asked for a summary of the proposed development program and further explanation of outdoor open spaces/areas on site. The rezoning application seeks approval to develop up to 1,366 residential units; 1.85 million sq ft of office and light industrial uses and 950,000 sq ft of commercial and retail uses; along with three public use sites (community park, fire and rescue site, elementary school site). A slide from the staff presentation at the public hearing illustrating the proposed overall site layout is provided as *Attachment 9*. From this slide and illustrations provided by the Applicant as part of the plan set and statement of justification, there are a variety of outdoor features proposed on site, including a main plaza within the Town Center (to include lawns, pavilions, and outdoor seating and event areas), and the age-restricted community center portion of the site (to include an event lawn, tennis courts, putting green, croquet lawn, bocce ball court). Other outdoor residential areas would be part of each single family detached and attached unit proposed on site (e.g. porches, decks, yards). All of these areas will likely be adversely impacted by aircraft noise as a result of the airport operations discussed above. These outdoor spaces are far more susceptible to adverse impact by airport operations than would an office or industrial park, where the majority of users would be inside and not using the area for recreational purposes or social gatherings. This is a primary reason why the planned land uses for the area do not include a residential component and why residential uses should not be permitted on this site.

Elementary School Site

The Commission asked a question regarding the typical walk zone radius around elementary schools in the County. School Board policy establishes that transportation will be provided to elementary school students living more than 0.8 mile from their assigned school; students living less than 0.8 mile from their assigned school would therefore be required to walk to the facility. This distance may be adjusted should “unusual hazards” exist that would make walking to the school unsafe. A copy of the school board transportation policy is provided as *Attachment 10*. In the staff report and at the public hearing, staff has suggested that the Applicant investigate and propose an alternative pedestrian connection from the development to the school site, located across the Dulles Greenway, as County policy calls for public school sites to be located at the focus of their attendance areas and be linked to adjacent neighborhoods by sidewalks or trails. To date, no response from the Applicant on this matter has been received.

With respect to overall access to the school site, staff and the Applicant have had a discussion regarding improvements to Shreve Mill Road west of the Dulles Greenway. The current alignment of Shreve Mill Road west of the Greenway serves as frontage to the school site, and needs to be improved to provide paved access to the site. While discussions indicated the Applicant’s willingness to improve this section of Shreve Mill Road, no written commitment to this effect has been received.

Basis for Staff Recommendation of Denial of Rezoning Application

The Planning Commission asked staff to explain the recommendation of denial for the rezoning application: was it based on the fact the proposal does not comply with the land use designation in the Plan; analysis of deficiencies in the proposal relating to policy guidance and ordinance requirements; or whether there is a better land use scenario for this property?

CPAM. The rezoning application is not consistent with County or Town Comprehensive Plan land use designations and utility policies. The Applicant's CPAM language is intended to address these fundamental issues. Ideally a decision on the CPAM would determine whether the land use mix and utility delivery proposals are acceptable. If a decision is made to approve the proposed Plan amendment, then attention could be focused on the details of the Applicant's rezoning proposal.

Findings for Denial. There are a number of outstanding issues related to the Applicant's rezoning proposal. As noted in the ZMAP staff report, staff's basis for its recommendation of denial include (1) non-compliance with currently adopted land use policies for the area, (2) the potential for adverse impacts to Leesburg Airport, (3) utility provision inconsistent with currently adopted policies, (4) transportation impacts are not adequately mitigated such that construction of critical road improvements in the vicinity of the site is ensured, and (5) zoning modifications proposed for the town center portion of the site do not reflect the intent of the PD-TC zoning district.

Recommended Land Use Designations. As a part of this question, staff was asked what land use recommendations staff would make for the subject property today assuming there was no Plan in place. The property is uniquely situated because it is a gateway property, and is located between the Greenway and the Leesburg airport. These factors together, differentiate it from other properties in the County that are also designated for Keynote/Business Employment use. Staff notes that while there is precedent for approving mixed use projects in areas designated for Keynote (e.g. Ashbrook), there are no mixed use proposals that have been approved by the County with residential components that are located in close proximity to Dulles or Leesburg Airport. At the public hearing, the Planning Commission asked about the Stratford development which is situated north of the Leesburg Airport. This development was approved as a mixed use development including residential uses. It was approved by the Town of Leesburg in 1990 when the property was being considered as a location for a new county government building. The mixed use plan included a civic component for the proposed County building. The northern portion of this plan was approved for residential development and the southern portion of the plan contained office and retail uses.

Long-standing land use policy has supported the airport and staff has considered whether the airport continues to be a viable resource to Leesburg and Loudoun County. Input received by the Town staff, the Airport Commission, Leesburg leadership, the FAA and pilots alike indicate that the airport continues to contribute to the multi-modal transportation network in the area; continues to grow in usage by corporate and private aviators; and is an important resource for medical and emergency planning. The draft master plan shows further improvements which will expand the airports functional capabilities which will in turn expand its appeal as a corporate airport and increase its fiscal viability. As discussed above, financial investments in the facilities and operations of the airport by the Town and the FAA attest to local and federal commitment to its viability. As such, current policy to protect the airport should be maintained. Uses on the subject property should not only be compatible with the airport operations but ideally they should contribute to the airport's viability as a local transportation and economic development resource. Likewise, the airport will continue to add economic development value as a resource to local business and industry.

Additionally, the visibility of this property along the Dulles Greenway affords a unique opportunity for development of employment uses. While this property has remained undeveloped in the past, several key factors will likely change that condition in the near future. The on-going construction of the Greenway interchanges at Battlefield Parkway and Crosstrail Boulevard will make this site

even more valuable as a property for future employment use. Also, the office market continues to become stronger, particularly at both ends of the Greenway. The Town of Leesburg is experiencing a low inventory of land for office development. The County Department of Economic Development increasingly receives inquiries from business prospects about locations that are proximate to Leesburg and which have location off the Greenway. Areas designated for Keynote/Business Employment uses in the Greenway corridor are an important piece of the overall economic development strategy for the County. As market conditions increasingly demand more office development, the County should be poised to offer a diverse inventory of sites to prospective businesses looking for prime office locations. The subject property is an important part of that employment use inventory.

Finally, as the subject property is sandwiched between an airport and a major road facility, noise and vibration will be factors both day and night. Consequently, because of the nuisance factors, this site is best suited for business uses and not residential development.

For the reasons stated above, staff believes that the best use for the subject property is a mixture of light industrial uses adjacent to the airport and office uses adjacent to the Greenway. Retail uses could also be introduced into the mix; however, because the site is directly adjacent to the Town, the amount of retail should complement the predominant use of the site for office and light industrial use as well as contribute to the overall economic development objectives of the Town of Leesburg. A retail study that includes analysis of the greater Leesburg area would help to determine the appropriate amount of retail for this site. Lastly, the master plan for the airport includes plans for future expansion on the west side of the airport. Staff recommends that further discussion between the Applicant and the Town take place to fully discuss this point so that expansion plans are not precluded by development of the subject site.

Other Outstanding Issues

Zoning Modifications for Town Center

As noted in the ZMAP staff report and presentation at the public hearing, staff cannot support the zoning modifications proposed for the PD-TC (Town Center) portion of the site, as the scale and scope of the modifications would alter requirements to an extent that is not consistent with the intent of the zoning district. Please refer to the ZMAP staff report for further discussion of this issue.

Project Phasing

Staff has suggested that the Applicant incorporate the proposed age-restricted units into the overall phasing plan for the site so as to ensure a balance of residential and commercial uses as site development progresses. Further, it is unclear as to whether the overall phasing of the site (generally speaking, from south to north) will be realized based on the language contained in the most recent proffer statement (revised April 19, 2006). Staff suggested to the Applicant that phasing be clarified, but to date no revised proffers have been received. Additionally, staff suggested to the Applicant that on-site recreational facilities be further defined/clarified and accelerated to an earlier point in time, but to date no written commitment from the Applicant to this effect has been received.

Environmental Mitigation

Staff has suggested that the Applicant further clarify and refine its proposed environmental mitigation measures on site regarding wetlands, tree save areas, and stormwater management. Please refer to the ZMAP staff report for further discussion of this issue. To date, no further responses from the Applicant on this matter have been received.

Fiscal/Economic Impact

As discussed in detail in the ZMAP staff report, the Applicant's anticipated capital facilities contributions for the residential portions of the proposed development are in the range between approximately \$13.1 million and \$21.0 million; the lower figure reflects the anticipated contribution should the Board of Supervisors choose to request only the non-schools portion of the overall capital costs for the 523 age-restricted market-rate (non-ADU) units in the development, while the higher figure accounts for the full anticipated capital facilities costs without regard to the age-restricted units. Currently, the Applicant is proffering a total cash contribution of approximately \$10.7 million (\$22,291.00 for each of the 92 conventional market rate (non-age-restricted, non-ADU) SFA units on site, and \$12,611.00 for each of the 686 conventional market rate (non-age-restricted, non-ADU) MF units on site). From this \$10.7 million figure, the Applicant proposes to take credit for dedication of the three public facilities/sites proposed within the development: the 8-acre community park, the 11-acre fire and rescue site, and the 19-acre elementary school site, as well as for extension of utilities to the school site. This proposed amount is inconsistent with current County policy and does not mitigate the development's capital facilities impacts even if a reduced figure is assessed for age-restricted units.

Fiscal Overview of Project vs. Fiscal Analysis of Airport

The Commission requested a comparison of the revenues and expenditures generated from the proposed Crosstrail development with that of the Leesburg Airport. Staff has discussed this question with Management and Financial Services staff, who advised that such an analysis is not possible as the proposed development and the existing airport uses are not comparable situations. With respect to the Crosstrail proposal, revenues that generated would be from a variety of taxes paid to the County (e.g., real property, personal property, sales, BPOL, TOT, recordation, utility taxes) and expenditures would be for public services (e.g., schools, emergency services, libraries, parks and recreation, etc). With respect to the airport, the primary benefit is more economic than fiscal as the airport no only serves as an catalyst for other businesses to locate in the area but also provides a larger public benefit as part of a multi-modal transportation system, provides a base for emergency services (e.g., medical helicopter transport, operations base in case of regional emergency), and serves to relieve pressure from Dulles Airport. As noted in *Attachment 5*, the state estimates that a total of 617 jobs, \$16.97 million in wages, and \$40.58 million in economic activity is generated by Leesburg Airport through both direct and "spin-off" (indirect) economic impacts. Staff from Management and Financial Services will be available at the worksession to answer further questions and discuss this matter in greater detail.

Fiscal Impact of Crosstrail Proposal vs. Planned Land Use

The Applicant has submitted a fiscal impact analysis (dated February 14, 2005) which compares the fiscal impact of the Crosstrail proposal with a land development scenario as anticipated in the Comprehensive Plan. The scenarios that were compared are as follows:

Crosstrail Proposal	Residential – 1,380 market rate units Retail – 751,000 square feet Office – 1,297,000 squarer feet Hotel – 230 rooms
Comprehensive Plan	Office – 5,924,000 square feet

The Applicant's analysis shows a differential of 1.1 million square between the development proposal and the use designated in the Comprehensive Plan (year 2013). Over a 20-year period, the Crosstrail proposal is estimated to generate a positive net fiscal impact of \$256 million versus a positive net fiscal impact of \$36 million for the Comprehensive Plan scenario.

As with any fiscal analysis, the results are directly attributable to the assumptions made about the proposed development. Staff offers a few observations about the analysis:

- The pure office land development scenario as represented in the analysis for the Comprehensive Plan scenario represents one development option that would be supported by the Plan policy. However, the Business Employment land use mix contained in the Toll Road Plan would allow for either office and/or light industrial land use mixes. The optimum build out scenario would likely include a mixture of office, light industrial, and associated retail to serve these uses. The later might include a mixed use development including office, residential and civic/open space uses to the extent that they are compatible with, and do not pose safety hazards (e.g. height issues) to, airport operations. Thus, the preferred land use scenario for the subject property would not be purely office uses, but rather a mixture of these uses. Consequently, the fiscal impacts would differ from those represented in the Applicant's analysis.
- The net fiscal revenue for the Crosstrail proposal may be overstated. The analysis shows a differential of 1.1 million square feet in total square feet on non-residential land use between the two scenarios. Staff questions whether this represents new, induced demand for non-residential uses or whether this simply represents shifting demand from different locations in the Town or County. Similarly, the net fiscal revenue is likely underrepresented for the Comprehensive Plan scenario because the analysis assumes that no proffers would be required under the Comprehensive Plan scenario. It is unclear why this assumption has been made. Staff notes that the Comprehensive Plan scenario is referred to as the "by-right" scenario as noted above and that perhaps the Applicant may be assuming that no proffers could be obtained relating to the development of the site. This is not correct. For any rezoning of this property, mitigation of impacts through proffers would be anticipated.

As noted, staff from Management and Financial Services will be available to answer questions about the fiscal comparisons.

Capital Facilities Standards/Park Site

Regarding a Commission question about Capital Facilities Standards with respect to the proposed community park site, staff notes that the 8-acre park site is below the minimum 30-acre standard adopted by the Board of Supervisors in February 2005. The 30-acre Community Park standard is the smallest park size for which the policy would allow for capital facilities credit to be considered. Staff is not opposed to smaller parks, but raised this issue in the staff report and presentation due to the conflict with adopted BOS policy as the Applicant claims capital facilities credit for the site and facilities to be constructed within the park. Staff notes that the guidelines are policies which the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors are not compelled to follow, though staff's recommendation on this and other matters in a rezoning application must be consistent with adopted policy.

Comparison of Capital Facilities for Age-Restricted Units and on Balance of Project

The net fiscal cost of the Crosstrail proposal may be understated due to the per-unit cost attributed to the age-restricted housing. The analysis shows a Capital Intensity Factor that is \$5,954.00 per age-restricted unit. This assumption is only accurate if there is certainty that no children will reside in these units. The proffers do not indicate that restrictive covenants will assure this to be the case. As noted in the staff report, federal regulations only require that at least 80% of the occupied units be occupied by at least one person who is 55 years of age or older, therefore, up to 20% of the units can be occupied by non-senior residents. Also, children cannot be excluded from living with a senior resident 55 year of age or older in some retirement housing developments. As such, a commitment to assure age-restricted living may be a difficult to assure over time. Consequently, the capital impact may likely be closer to the per-unit cost attributed to multi-family units at \$11,541.00.

Personal Property Tax Rate on Aircraft

The current County personal property tax rate on aircraft based in the County is \$0.01 per \$100 of valuation.

Utilities

Existing Policy

As noted at the public hearing, the existing utility policy in the Revised General Plan states that the Town will provide utilities to properties in the JLMA unless another provider is decided upon by the Town and the County. The County's policies allow for utility extensions into the JLMA. In the past, the Town agreed to provide utilities outside of the corporate limits to subdivisions in the northeast quadrant of the JLMA including River Creek, Potomac Station (portion in the County), and Spring Lakes residential subdivisions. These subdivisions, while currently served with Town utilities, are not within the corporate limits. However, the Town's current policy is to extend utilities to properties in the JLMA only after they have been brought into the corporate limits.

Annexation/Utility Policy

A phasing plan for annexation of property and utility provision has not been adopted for the JLMA. In recent years, boundary line adjustments have occurred on a property-by-property basis at the request of the property owners. Properties may be considered for a corporate boundary line adjustment or annexation if they are contiguous to the existing corporate limits.

Rates

The Town and LCSA utility rates are attached (*Attachment 11 and 12*). Effective July 1, 2006, the rate for Leesburg out-of-Town water service is \$5.71 / 1,000 gallons (\$7.78 / 1,000 gallons – surcharge rate) and sewer service is \$7.21 / 1,000 gallons (\$188.00 / quarter for sewer users only).

The LCSA's water and sewer rates vary depending on when the initial service was provided. Generally rates are \$1.64 / 1,000 gallons for water and \$2.59 / 1,000 gallons for sewer. The LCSA is considering rate increases for 2007-08.

Proposed Policy Change

Given the existing Plan policy on utility provision for the JLMA, the Town of Leesburg has planned to provide utilities to the subject site. As noted at the public hearing, the proposed change states that either the Town or the County could serve properties in the JLMA. At the public hearing, the Town and County staff provided maps showing locations for future Town utility facilities in the

JLMA (*Attachment 13*). The Planning Commission requested information regarding how the LCSA would serve the subject property and what the comparative costs would be for the Town versus the LCSA to provide service. Both the Town utility staff and the LCSA will be prepared to discuss the technical considerations for utility provision to the subject site. The LCSA has stated that they do not serve individual properties but rather, will only consider broader areas for service (*Attachment 14*). Thus the LCSA would only consider serving the entire JLMA area north of the Sycolin Creek and not just the Crosstrail property.

Staff has a number of concerns with the proposed utility policy. It introduces an element of uncertainty to the Town, County and property owners in the JLMA as to which entity will service properties with utilities. This makes it difficult to plan for ultimate capacity needs and for correct sizing and location of utility facilities. In addition, the proposed change will result in uncertainty about utility provision for County-owned facilities in the JLMA. The Town and the County staff have been negotiating an agreement for utilities to serve the County detention facility. This agreement is ready to go to the Town Council and Board of Supervisors for review however, it has been put on hold pending consideration of this proposal. It should be noted that if adopted, the proposed policy may effectively delay the delivery of this County facility. The timing of utility delivery would depend on the developer who would fund the design process and installation of the necessary utilities. Finally, this policy change may also ultimately affect the Town's plans for annexation of areas in the JLMA. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission discuss this aspect of the proposed policy change with the Town to better understand the Town's corporate expansion plans.

Town, LCSA, and County staff will be prepared to discuss this topic in detail with the Planning Commission at the subsequent worksession on a date to be determined.

Transportation

Staff's has consulted with OTS regarding the three specific transportation questions posed at the public hearing. These questions were regarding (1) analysis of 39% trip assignment to the Greenway; (2) construction of Battlefield Parkway and Crosstrail Boulevard on site should this property develop "by-right"; and (3) rationale for requesting off-site road improvements. OTS responses to these questions are provided below.

Percentage of Trips Allocated to Dulles Greenway/OTS Analysis

OTS advises that the Applicant has submitted no definitive justification that supports the 39% peak hour assignment of trips to the Greenway. However, given the high tolls on the Greenway, it would seem logical to assume the primary market for Greenway from/to Crosstrail would consist of long-distance commuter trips to/from the east. It does not seem reasonable that short, non-work trips would use the Greenway because of the tolls. An examination of ITE peak hour does not cast additional light on the issue.

Given the lack of hard data, OTS has not attempted additional analysis. Nor has it asked for the Applicant to change their traffic study. Origin/Destination trip tables produced through computer modeling may produce more relevant numbers in the future.

To the extent that toll resistance diverts traffic away from the Greenway and the 39% assumption proves to be too high, trips beyond those assumed in the traffic shed will use other roads. The alternate roads include Sycolin Road, the Route 15 Bypass, Route 7, and the future Battlefield Parkway and Crosstrail Boulevard. This would accelerate the need for improvements to these

roads. To date, the Applicant has offered cash contributions to be used by others to construct portions of this off-site road network. As of this writing, written commitment from the Applicant to provide off-site construction has not been received.

“By-Right” Scenario for Construction of Battlefield Parkway and Crosstrail Boulevard On-Site

The Keynote/Business Employment planned land uses on site are not the current “by-right” uses for the property. Only about 30 acres of the 491-acre site is currently zoned for non-residential uses (PD-IP); if the PD-IP area were developed at a 0.30 FAR, approximately 400,000 sq ft of non-residential uses would be realized. Approximately 434 acres on site is currently zoned JLMA-20, which would yield approximately 21 single family detached units “by-right” (one dwelling unit per 20 acres). Another approximately 21 acres is currently zoned A-3, which would yield approximately 7 dwelling units. To achieve the Keynote/Business Employment land uses currently called for by the Revised General Plan and the Toll Road Plan would require a rezoning. Substantial proffers would be sought from those rezoning applications.

Rationale for Requesting Off-Site Road Improvements for Roads that do not Border the Site (including Crosstrail Boulevard within Phil Bolen Park)

With respect to Crosstrail Boulevard within Phil Bolen Park and elsewhere, OTS has advised that the construction of Crosstrail Boulevard will require substantial proffer participation. With respect to Battlefield Parkway, only a short section passes along the site’s northern boundary; this section will be constructed in conjunction with the Battlefield Parkway/Dulles Greenway interchange and by the developers of the Oaklawn project regardless of the outcome of the Crosstrail application.

With respect to the more general question regarding regional road improvements, rezoning applications typically involve off-site proffers. The two major forms this takes are physical construction and regional road improvement cash contributions. Currently, the Applicant is proffering only cash contributions, and staff has noted (as discussed above and in the ZMAP staff report) that off-site construction is necessary to adequately mitigate the development’s transportation impacts. Stone Ridge and the East Gate Assemblage rezonings (both along Route 50) are recent examples of rezonings that proffered off-site physical construction. All approved rezonings along Route 659 have included contributions or construction, much of which is off-site. Increasingly, the Board of Supervisors has emphasized physical construction, an approach strongly supported by OTS.

Other Outstanding Issues

As noted in the ZMAP staff report and presentation at the public hearing, there are a number of other outstanding transportation-related issues, namely (1) mitigation of highway noise impacts and (2) appropriate accommodation of commuter trips generated by the development. Written responses to these matters from the Applicant have not been received to date. Staff will be available to answer any questions and further discuss these matters at the subsequent worksession on a date to be determined.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward this item to a subsequent worksession for discussion of remaining issues/topics.

SUGGESTED MOTIONS

1. I move that the Planning Commission forward CPAM 2006-0002 and ZMAP 2005-0011, Crosstrail, to committee for further discussion.

OR,

2. I move an alternate motion.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Summary of Airport Issues
2. Executive Summary of Virginia Air Transportation System Plan Update
3. Leesburg Airport Arrival and Destination/Departure Information
4. Noise Characteristics
5. Virginia Airport System Economic Impact Study
6. Leesburg Airport Grant History
7. Grant Assurance Summary
8. Email from Vice Chairman of Leesburg Airport Commission
9. Crosstrail Site Plan/Proposed Development Summary
10. School Board Transportation Policy
11. Leesburg Utility Rates
12. LCSA Utility Rates
13. Town Planned Utilities
14. Letter from LCSA
15. Draft Leesburg Airport Layout Plan
16. Aerial Photograph/Regional Vicinity Map
17. Crosstrail Site Plan/Development Proposal with 65 Ldn Noise Contour

NOTE: Attachments are not available electronically, but may be viewed at the Planning Department front counter or in the Building and Development file room.